UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/514,053	02/25/2000	Scott C. Harris	SCH/TRAVEL	7148

23844	7590	06/16/2004	

SCOTT C HARRIS
P O BOX 927649
SAN DIEGO, CA 92192

EXAMINER
MORGAN, ROBERT W

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
3626	

DATE MAILED: 06/16/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 10/03)

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/514,053	HARRIS, SCOTT C.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Robert W. Morgan	3626

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>02 February 2004</u>.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) <u>2,3,5 and 8-17</u> is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) <u>2,3,5 and 8-17</u> is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

    1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

    2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

    3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Notice to Applicant

1.   In the amendment filed 2/2/04 in paper number 13, the following has occurred: Claims 1, 4, 6-7 and 19-40 have been canceled and claims 5, 8, 9, 11, 14, and 18 have been amended. Now claims 2-3, 5 and 8-18 are presented for examination.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

3.   Claims 8, 9, 12, 15 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,948,040 to DeLorme et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,578,078 to Smith et al.

As per claim 8, DeLorme et al. teaches a Travel Reservation Information Planning System or TRIPS where users (100, Fig. 1A) using a desktop computer (105, Fig. 1A) with at least one computer communication connection or modem link (107, Fig. 1A) and one or more private or public computer network such as the Internet including interactive communication with one or more third-party providers or diverse travel information, reservation, accommodation, transportation, ticketing and/or other travel-related goods/service (see: column 13, lines 48-58). The TRIPS software allows user to construct travel plans using electronic maps presented on the computer's display and the user selects a travel origin, travel destination, and desired waypoints. The software also calculates, delineates and displays a travel route between the travel origin and the travel destination via the selected waypoints (see: column 8, lines 33-

39). TRIPS input terminology or technology is not restricted to illustration in (Fig. 1C) but also

includes input means such as voice recognition, natural language, text queries, keystroke or

mouse input, "virtual reality" input/output devices, map/calendar/subject-matter/transactional

graphic user interface, relational data queries and/or other state-of-the-art input means known or

readily implemented in the digital computer software field (see: column 23, line 64 to column

24, line 13). DeLorme et al. also the TRIPS software sub-menu WHERE? For example a user

proposes an initial departure point and final destination point and one or more optimal routes are

computed according to the user selected parameters e.g., Quickest, Shortest, Scenic, and so forth

(see: column 29, lines 9-31). Furthermore, DeLorme teaches the TRIPS software sub-menu

HOW? For example, the user can compare cost (reads on "information about how much the trip

deviates") and availability of alternate mode of transportations (see: column 30, column 18-23).

The Examiner considers comparing cost (information) equivalent to how much the trip deviates

when comparing the optimum route (TRIPS software sub-menu WHERE? that includes initial

departure point and final destination point and one or more optimal routes which are computed

according to the user selected parameters e.g., Quickest, Shortest, Scenic, and so forth) from

starting and ending area.

DeLorme et al. fails to explicitly teach selecting a hyperlink images including a cursor

and actuator that is actuated to select a beginning and end point for travel.

Smith et al. teaches a method for preserving referential integrity within a web site where

hyperlinks are associated with picture icons and text block pairs and once activated by click the

icon detailed information regarding the particular icons is displayed to the user (see: column 10,

line 25 to column 11, line 13).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time

the invention was made to include the hyperlinks associated with picture icons and text block

pairs as taught by Smith et al. within the Travel Reservation Information and Planning System

taught by DeLorme with motivation of addressing the problem of broken hyperlinks to resources

that have been moved (see: Smith et al.: column 7, lines 61-64).

As per claim 9, DeLorme et al. teaches the claimed amount of deviation includes

information about travel times of different routes. This limitation is met by the TRIPS software

sub-menu WHERE? For example a user proposes an initial departure point and final destination

point and one or more optimal routes are computed according to the user selected parameters

e.g., Quickest, Shortest, Scenic, and so forth (see: column 29, lines 9-31). The Examiner

considers the Quickest or Shortest route to include different times.

As per claim 12, DeLorme et al. teaches a Travel Reservation Information Planning

System or TRIPS where users (100, Fig. 1A) using a desktop computer (105, Fig. 1A) with at

least one computer communication connection or modem link (107, Fig. 1A) and one or more

private or public computer network such as the Internet including interactive communication

with one or more third-party providers or diverse travel information, reservation,

accommodation, transportation, ticketing and/or other travel-related goods/service (see: column

13, lines 48-58). The TRIPS software allows user to construct travel plans using electronic maps

presented on the computer's display and the user selects a travel origin, travel destination, and

desired waypoints. The software also calculates, delineates and displays a travel route between

the travel origin and the travel destination via the selected waypoints (see: column 8, lines 33-

39). TRIPS input terminology or technology is not restricted to illustration in (Fig. 1C) but also

includes input means such as voice recognition, natural language, text queries, keystroke or

mouse input, "virtual reality" input/output devices, map/calendar/subject-matter/transactional

graphic user interface, relational data queries and/or other state-of-the-art input means known or

readily implemented in the digital computer software field (see: column 23, line 64 to column

24, line 13). In addition, DeLorme et al. teaches that the user can optionally input preferred

modes of transportation, specify a particular airline or airport (see: column 19, lines 4-8).

DeLorme et al. fails to explicitly teach displaying a hyperlinked image including a

movable element which is movable over said hyperlinked image, and said movable element is

actuated to select an area of said hyperlinked image.

Smith et al. teaches a method for preserving referential integrity within a web site where

hyperlinks are associated with picture icons and text block pairs and once activated by click the

icon detailed information regarding the particular icons is displayed to the user (see: column 10,

line 25 to column 11, line 13).

The obviousness of combining the teachings of Smith et al. within the system of

DeLorme et al. is discussed in the rejection of claim 1, and incorporated herein.

As per claim 15, DeLorme et al. teaches the claimed processor is operative to determine

an optimal flying route between said begin point and said end point, and display an actual

selected flying route relative to said optimal flying route. This feature is met by the TRIPS

software sub-menu WHERE? For example a user proposes an initial departure point and final

destination point and one or more optimal routes are computed according to the user selected

parameters e.g., Quickest, Shortest, Scenic, and so forth (see: column 29, lines 9-31). In addition,

DeLorme further teaches that the software calculates, delineates and displays a travel route

between the travel origin and the travel destination via the selected waypoints (see: column 8, lines 33-39). The Examiner considers the Quickest or Shortest route to include the optimal flying route between the beginning point and ending point.

As per claim 16, DeLorme et al. teaches the claimed processor is further operative to determine a deviation between the optimal flying route and said selected flying route. This limitation is met by the TRIPS software sub-menu WHERE? For example a user proposes an initial departure point and final destination point and one or more optimal routes are computed according to the user selected parameters e.g., Quickest, Shortest, Scenic, and so forth (see: column 29, lines 9-31).

4.   Claims 14 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,948,040 to DeLorme et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,578,078 to Smith et al. as applied to claim 12 above, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,360,205 to Iyengar et al.

As per claim 14, DeLorme et al. and Smith et al. teach the TRIPS software sub-menu WHERE? For example a user proposes an initial departure point and final destination point and one or more optimal routes are computed according to the user selected parameters e.g., Quickest, Shortest, Scenic, and so forth (see: DeLorme et al.: column 29, lines 9-31). The Examiner considers the Quickest, Shortest and Scenic routes to be the matrix of flights between the beginning point and ending point.

DeLorme et al. and Smith et al. fail to explicitly teach one airport within at least one of the beginning or end point.

Iyengar et al. teaches a method for providing reservation information related to airline flights including flight preferences where a user enters a home airport and selects whether to

search more airports near the departure city or arrival city (see: Fig. 7 and Fig. 8). Furthermore, after the user receives results from the flight preferences information, he may perform an additional search using more defined criteria such as nearby or closest departing and arriving airports (see: column 11, lines 7-42 and Fig. 8 and 10).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include flight preferences including airports with predefined distances as taught by Iyengar et al. with as taught by DeLorme et al. and Smith et al. with the motivation of allowing comparison of reservation information from a number of reservation providers (see: Iyengar et al.: column 3, lines 24-26).

As per claim 18, DeLorme et al. and Smith et al. teach the TRIPS output that includes the online transmission of the user's reservation requests, ticket purchase, changes, credit/payment arrangement, and so forth, directly to the third-party providers participating in TRIPS (see: column 12, lines 5-10).

DeLorme et al. and Smith et al. fail to explicitly teach one airport within at least one of the beginning or end point.

Iyengar et al. teaches a method for providing reservation information related to airline flights including flight preferences where a user enters a home airport and selects whether to search more airports near the departure city or arrival city (see: Fig. 7 and Fig. 8). Furthermore, after the user receives results from the flight preferences information, he may perform an additional search using more defined criteria such as nearby or closest departing and arriving airports (see: column 11, lines 7-42 and Fig. 8 and 10).

The obviousness of combining the teachings of Iyengar et al. with the system of

DeLorme et al. and Smith et al. is discussed in the rejection of claim 14, and incorporated herein.

5.   Claims 2, 3, 5 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S.

Patent No. 5,948,040 to DeLorme et al. and U.S. Patent No. 6,578,078 to Smith et al. in view of

Official Notice.

As per claim 2, DeLorme et al. teaches a Travel Reservation Information Planning

System or TRIPS where users (100, Fig. 1A) using a desktop computer (105, Fig. 1A) with at

least one computer communication connection or modem link (107, Fig. 1A) and one or more

private or public computer network such as the Internet including interactive communication

with one or more third-party providers or diverse travel information, reservation,

accommodation, transportation, ticketing and/or other travel-related goods/service (see: column

13, lines 48-58). The TRIPS software allows user to construct travel plans using electronic maps

presented on the computer's display and the user selects a travel origin, travel destination, and

desired waypoints. The software also calculates, delineates and displays a travel route between

the travel origin and the travel destination via the selected waypoints (see: column 8, lines 33-

39). TRIPS input terminology or technology is not restricted to illustration in (Fig. 1C) but also

includes input means such as voice recognition, natural language, text queries, keystroke or

mouse input, "virtual reality" input/output devices, map/calendar/subject-matter/transactional

graphic user interface, relational data queries and/or other state-of-the-art input means known or

readily implemented in the digital computer software field (see: column 23, line 64 to column

24, line 13).

DeLorme et al. fails to teach:

--the claimed cursor moving element to place a cursor of the graphical user interface over said starting area and actuating said actuator to select said starting area, and allowing said ending area for said travel to be selected by using said cursor moving element to place the cursor of the graphical user interface over said ending area, and actuating the actuator to indicate said end area; and

--the claimed wherein said server interfacing program further allows at least one of said starting area or said ending area to be changed in size to form a changed in size area, by using said cursor moving element to change a size of said at least one, and wherein said first travel information includes information about said changed in size area, and said travel information received from said server includes options for different locations within said changed in size area.

It is well known in the computer field to that graphical user interface such a cursor, which is special on-screen indicator used with applications and operating systems such as a mouse or other on-screen icons that move with movements of the mouse and actuators, which are disk drive mechanism for moving the read/write heads to location of the desired track on a disk are old and well established. Since DeLorme et al. teaches the use of electronic maps delineated to display a travel route between the travel origin and the travel destination via the selected waypoints (see: column 8, lines 33-39). DeLorme et al. further teaches a button used to pan/zoom in on the selected travel route by the user (see: Fig. 5D). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include a cursor to select a starting and ending point of the selected travel route within the Travel Reservation Information Planning System as taught by DeLorme et al. with motivation of decreasing the amount of

keystroke entries by the user, thereby providing a more efficient and effective way of selecting a desired travel route.

As per claim 3, DeLorme et al. teaches the claimed server computer produces an image of a line extending between said starting point and said ending point, overlaid on said map. This limitation is met by the TRIPS software that allows a user to construct travel plans using an electronic map presented on the computer's display and selects a travel origin, travel destination, and desired waypoints. DeLorme et al. further teaches that TRIPS software calculates, delineates and displays a travel route between the travel origin and the travel destination via the selected waypoints (see: column 8, lines 33-39).

As per claim 5, DeLorme et al. teaches the claimed line includes an indication of a stopping point between said beginning point and said ending. This feature is met by the TRIPS software that allows a user to construct travel plans using an electronic map presented on the computer's display and selects a travel origin, travel destination, and desired waypoints. DeLorme et al. further teaches that TRIPS software calculates, delineates and displays a travel route between the travel origin and the travel destination via the selected waypoints (see: column 8, lines 33-39).

As per claim 10, DeLorme et al. teaches the claimed starting area and ending area include information about airports within said areas, and said changing size is operative to add or subtract airports within said areas. The limitation is met by the button used to pan/zoom in on the selected travel route by the user (see: Fig. 5D). DeLorme et al. further teaches that the user can optionally input preferred modes of transportation, specify a particular airline or airport (see: column 19, lines 4-8).

6.   Claim 13 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No.

5,948,040 to DeLorme et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,578,078 to Smith et al. as applied to

claim 1 above, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,606,101 to Malamud et al.

As per claim 13, DeLorme et al. and Smith et al. teach TRIPS where users (100, Fig. 1A)

using a desktop computer (105, Fig. 1A) with at least one computer communication connection

or modem link (107, Fig. 1A) and one or more private or public computer network such as the

Internet including interactive communication with one or more third-party providers or diverse

travel information, reservation, accommodation, transportation, ticketing and/or other travel-

related goods/service (see: DeLorme et al.: column 13, lines 48-58).

DeLorme et al. and Smith et al. fail to teach the claimed screen tip displayed on the

image about area of said cursor.

Malamud et al. teaches a system that uses information pointers where a user using an

input device selects an object designated by the positioning of the cursor over at least a portion

of one of the objects that is being displayed. Malamud et al. further teaches that the output device

formed by the video display, textual and/or graphical information about the selected object is

displayed in an information window adjacent to the cursor (see: column 1, lines 49-65).

One of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would have found it

obvious to include information pointer system using textual information as taught by Malamud et

al. with the system as taught by DeLorme et al. and Smith et al. with the motivation of providing

the user with information about what they are currently doing or what the user is about to do

(see: Malamud et al.: column 1, lines 44-46).

7.   Claims 11 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S.

Patent No. 5,948,040 to DeLorme et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,578,078 to Smith et al. as

applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,085,976 to Sehr.

As per claim 11, DeLorme et al. and Smith et al. teach a Travel Reservation Information

Planning System or TRIPS where users (100, Fig. 1A) using a desktop computer (105, Fig. 1A)

with at least one computer communication connection or modem link (107, Fig. 1A) and one or

more private or public computer network such as the Internet including interactive

communication with one or more third-party providers or diverse travel information, reservation,

accommodation, transportation, ticketing and/or other travel-related goods/service (see:

DeLorme et al.: column 13, lines 48-58).

DeLorme et al. and Smith et al. fails to teach a biometric information entry device at the

client computer, which allows entering biometric information that is used to access a stored

travel itinerary from the client computer.

Sehr teaches a travel system and methods of utilizing multi-application passenger card

that allow a passenger to interact with or couple to the system while planning evaluating a

particular trip including making the appropriate reservation related to a ticket and travel

information (see: column 4, lines 27-32). Sehr further teaches a biometric box (13, Fig. 1)

including a means for capturing and digitizing the biometric characteristics information (see:

column 6, lines 52-55).

One of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would have found it

obvious to include the travel system using a biometric box as taught by Sehr with the system of

DeLorme et al. and Smith et al. with the motivation of reducing administrative costs, improving

productivity and to provide a better quality of service (see: Sehr: column 2, lines 7-13).

As per claim 17, it is rejected for same reasons set forth in claim 11.

Response to Arguments

8.   Applicant's arguments filed 2/2/04 have been fully considered but they are not

persuasive. Applicant's arguments will be addressed hereinbelow in the order in which they

appear in the response filed 2/2/04.

(A) In the remarks, Applicants argue in substance that, (1) DeLorme fails to teach how

much the trip deviates compared with an optimum route from the starting area to the ending area;

(2) DeLorme and Smith fail to teach the moveable element is "variable to change a number of

said airports which are included in said area"; (3) DeLorme fails to display the actual route

relative to any other route; (4) Nothing in DeLorme teaches a binding offer; (5) Nowhere in the

prior art teach or suggest changing in size an area for beginning and end points, and enabling

calculation of travel information between different locations within those points; and (6) It is not

known in the art to take Official Notice on changing the size an area on a computer screen to add

or subtract airport within that area.

(B) In response to Applicant's arguments that, (1) DeLorme fails to teach how much the

trip deviates compared with an optimum route from the starting area to the ending area. The

Examiner respectfully submits that this feature is address in section 4 in the above Office Action,

and incorporated herein.

(C) In response to Applicant's arguments that, (2) DeLorme and Smith fail to teach the

moveable element is "variable to change a number of said airports which are included in said

area". The Examiner respectfully submits DeLorme teaches TRIPS software that allows user to

construct travel plans using electronic maps presented on the computer's display and the user

selects a travel origin, travel destination, and desired waypoints. TRIPS input terminology or

technology is not restricted to illustration in (Fig. 1C) but also includes input means such as

voice recognition, natural language, text queries, keystroke or mouse input, "virtual reality"

input/output devices, map/calendar/subject-matter/transactional graphic user interface, relational

data queries and/or other state-of-the-art input means known or readily implemented in the

digital computer software field (see: column 23, line 64 to column 24, line 13). In addition,

DeLorme et al. teaches that the user can optionally input preferred modes of transportation,

specify a particular airline or airport (see: column 19, lines 4-8). In addition, the claim language

of claim 12 recites a "...movable element being variable to change a number of said airports

which are included within said area..." and the Examiner broadest interruption of a movable

element being variable to change suggests the mouse has the capability of changing the number

of airport. As such, the claims do not absolutely require any change be positively and definitely

made. The reference of DeLorme clearly demonstrates by way of TRIPS input terminology using

a mouse having the capability to select a travel origin, travel destination, and desired waypoints

that would include a different number of airports and as noted above, it is irrelevant whether a

change is actually performed, since the claim does not require a change, per se.

(D) In response to Applicant's arguments that, (3) DeLorme fails to display the actual

route relative to any other route. The Examiner respectfully submits DeLorme teaches TRIPS

software sub-menu WHERE? For example a user proposes an initial departure point and final

destination point and one or more optimal routes are computed according to the user selected

parameters e.g., Quickest, Shortest, Scenic, and so forth (see: column 29, lines 9-31). In addition,

DeLorme further teaches that the software calculates, delineates and displays a travel route

between the travel origin and the travel destination via the selected waypoints (see: column 8,

lines 33-39). The Examiner considers the Quickest, Shortest or Scenic route that are calculated

and delineated using TRIPS software to be displayed to user.

(E) In response to Applicant's arguments that, (4) Nothing in DeLorme teaches a binding

offer. The Examiner respectfully submits DeLorme et al. teaches TRIPS output including the

online transmission of the user's reservation requests, ticket purchase, changes, credit/payment

arrangement, and so forth (see: column 12, lines 5-10). The credit/payment arrangement and

ticket purchase is a clear indication that a binding offer has been given to the user.

(F) In response to Applicant's arguments that, (5) Nowhere in the prior art teach or

suggest changing in size an area for beginning and end points, and enabling calculation of travel

information between different locations within those points. The Examiner respectfully submits

that DeLorme et al. teaches the use of electronic map delineated to display a travel route between

the travel origin and the travel destination via the selected waypoints (see: column 8, lines 33-

39). In addition, DeLorme further teaches that the software calculates, delineates and displays a

travel route between the travel origin and the travel destination via the selected waypoints (see:

column 8, lines 33-39). Furthermore, DeLorme et al. teaches a button used to pan/zoom in on the

selected travel route by the user (see: Fig. 5D). This is a clear indication that the electronic maps

as described by DeLorme et al. utilize the pan/zoom feature to select a beginning and end point

for travel as well as calculating the waypoints or different location within the desired trip.

(G) In response to Applicant's arguments that, (6) It is not known in the art to take

Official Notice on changing the size an area on a computer screen to add or subtract airport

within that area. The Examiner respectfully submits DeLorme teaches a button used to pan/zoom

in on the selected travel route by the user (see: Fig. 5D). DeLorme et al. further teaches that the

user can optionally input preferred modes of transportation, specify a particular airline or airport

(see: column 19, lines 4-8). This suggest that the user can pan in/out on a selected travel route

that would include airports and the user can further input a specific airline or airport suggesting

that airports can changed or added and/or subtracted.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this

Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** See MPEP § 706.07(a).

Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE

MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO

MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after

the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period

will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37

CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event,

however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this

final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Robert W. Morgan whose telephone number is (703) 605-4441. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30 a.m. - 5:00 p.m. Mon - Fri.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Joseph Thomas can be reached on (703) 305-9588. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

RWM
rwm

JOSEPH THOMAS
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3600